UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

LARRY B. DIETZ,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No. 4:10CV2113 SNLJ
STATE OF MISSOURI, et al.,)	
STATE OF WIISSOURI, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon the motion of plaintiff (registration no. 151621), an inmate at St. Louis County Justice Center, for leave to commence this action without payment of the required filing fee [Doc. #2]. For the reasons stated below, the Court finds that plaintiff does not have sufficient funds to pay the entire filing fee and will assess an initial partial filing fee of \$14.83. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). Furthermore, based upon a review of the complaint, the Court finds that the complaint should be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1), a prisoner bringing a civil action in forma pauperis is required to pay the full amount of the filing fee. If the prisoner has insufficient funds in his or her prison account to pay the entire fee, the Court must assess and, when funds exist, collect an initial partial filing fee of 20 percent of the

greater of (1) the average monthly deposits in the prisoner's account, or (2) the average monthly balance in the prisoner's account for the prior six-month period. After payment of the initial partial filing fee, the prisoner is required to make monthly payments of 20 percent of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's account. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The agency having custody of the prisoner will forward these monthly payments to the Clerk of Court each time the amount in the prisoner's account exceeds \$10, until the filing fee is fully paid. Id.

Plaintiff has submitted an affidavit and a certified copy of his prison account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the submission of his complaint. A review of plaintiff's account indicates an average monthly deposit of \$74.17, and an average monthly balance of \$.65. Plaintiff has insufficient funds to pay the entire filing fee. Accordingly, the Court will assess an initial partial filing fee of \$14.83, which is 20 percent of plaintiff's average monthly deposit.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis in either law or fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action is malicious if it is

undertaken for the purpose of harassing the named defendants and not for the purpose of vindicating a cognizable right. Spencer v. Rhodes, 656 F. Supp. 458, 461-63 (E.D.N.C. 1987), aff'd 826 F.2d 1059 (4th Cir. 1987).

To determine whether an action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, the Court must engage in a two-step inquiry. First, the Court must identify the allegations in the complaint that are not entitled to the assumption of truth. Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1950-51 (2009). These include "legal conclusions" and "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action [that are] supported by mere conclusory statements." Id. at 1949. Second, the Court must determine whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief. Id. at 1950-51. This is a "context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense." Id. at 1950. The plaintiff is required to plead facts that show more than the "mere possibility of misconduct." Id. The Court must review the factual allegations in the complaint "to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief." Id. at 1951. When faced with alternative explanations for the alleged misconduct, the Court may exercise its judgment in determining whether plaintiff's conclusion is the most plausible or whether it is more likely that no misconduct occurred. Id. at 1950, 51-52.

The Complaint

Plaintiff brings this action for monetary damages against the following named defendants: the State of Missouri; the Circuit Court for the 21st Judicial Circuit; Shelle Bartram; Joan Gilmore; and Lauri Fortenburg. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Bartram, an employee in the St. Louis County Circuit Court Clerk's Office, defamed plaintiff when she "published" in a Court docket sheet on the internet that he was "guilty of a crime of sexual content and was stricken with a loathsome disease."

At the outset, the Court notes that plaintiff has failed to state the jurisdictional grounds for filing this action in federal court. To the extent that plaintiff is attempting to bring a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for a violation of his constitutional rights, the action must fail as plaintiff has not alleged a deprivation of a constitutional or federal statutory right. Parratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527, 535 (1981). As such, the case will be dismissed, without prejudice.

To the extent that plaintiff is attempting to bring this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, diversity jurisdiction does not exist, given that both plaintiff and defendants Bartram, Gilmore and Fortenburg are Missouri residents.¹

Accordingly,

¹Plaintiff is incarcerated at the St. Louis County Justice Center in Clayton, Missouri.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma

pauperis [Doc. #2] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff shall pay an initial filing fee

of \$14.83 within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order. Plaintiff is instructed to

make his remittance payable to "Clerk, United States District Court," and to include

upon it: (1) his name; (2) his prison registration number; (3) the case number; and (4)

that the remittance is for an original proceeding.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause

process to issue upon the complaint because the complaint is legally frivolous or fails

to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or both.

An Order of Dismissal will accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 27th day of December, 2010.

STEPHEN N. LIMBAUGH, JR.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

-5-